UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/587,778	07/28/2006	Hajime Maekawa	MAT-8872US	9923
52473 RATNERPRES	7590 01/14/201 STIA	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 980 VALLEY FOR	CE DA 10492	BENOIT, ESTHER		
VALLET FOR	UE, PA 19482		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2453	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/14/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/587,778	MAEKAWA ET AL.	
Examiner	Autilmit	
- LAGITIMIO	Art Unit	

	ESTHER BENOIT	2453	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>23 December 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	date of the final rejectio FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the size forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on the content of the corresponding amount of the content of the corresponding amount of the corresponding	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or			ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	npliant Amendment (f	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 33-59. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	planation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Krista M. Zele/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2453			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments have been considered but they are not persuasive. The applicants are arguing in substance the following: The prior art of record-O'Neill, does not disclose the limitation of claim 42 "wherein the sustain data received by the data processing apparatus indicates a connection time for the tunnel communication between the data processing apparatus and the other data processing apparatus exclusive of the access apparatus" because the prior art of record discloses the access apparatus forwards packets between the two data processing apparatus. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. According to paragraph [0070], O'Neill discloses that an alternative method of performing a tunneling connection, is to exclude the access node from either the signaling or tunneling method. Figure 10 shows the bypassing of the access nodes from the end node to the home mobility agent node. The applicants are arguing that the access nodes are essential for performing the tunneling communication however, O'Neill lets us know these nodes are passed over. Therefore, this suggests and confirms that the access nodes do not perform any operations for tunneling a connection between the end node and home mobility agent node. Combining the teachings of O'Toole with the teachings of O'Neill would yield an operable invention because the teachings of O'Neill modifies the teachings of O'Toole to suggest that an access apparatus does not have to be involved in the tunneling connection. The applicants argue that the reference King does not disclose using a data processing apparatus to judge the cancellation of the tunnel communication. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. King discloses that a proxy server makes the determination that a tunnel communication needs to be terminated based off of an unsecure request received from a mobile device [0030].